

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/808,224 | TEO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner THOMAS A. MORRISON | Art Unit 3653 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

(1) THOMAS A. MORRISON. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Steven Ormiston (Reg. No. 35,974). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2010
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
None
Claims discussed:
18-22
Prior art documents discussed:
None
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner contacted applicant's representative to find out if there were any outstanding issues in the above-identified application prior to allowance. Applicant's representative indicated that there were no remaining issues in this case and that it was ok to issue this case based on the decision in this case by the Board of Appeals reversing the previous rejection of claims 18-22. The examiner indicated that an updated search would be conducted and if no new reference is found, the case will be issued.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*/Saul J. Rodriguez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3652*
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)